

**From:** Cabrera-Stagno, Valentina  
**Required Attendees:** Squires, Kim; Turner, Kim; Foresman, Erin;  
Daniel.Worth@waterboards.ca.gov; Diane.Riddle@waterboards.ca.gov  
**Location:** Dial-In Number(s): (866) 299-3188, conference code: (415) 972-5623  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** Section 7 consultation on WQCP Update  
**Start Date/Time:** Mon 1/26/2015 9:30:00 PM  
**End Date/Time:** Mon 1/26/2015 11:00:00 PM

Adding the conference line information now.

Dial-In Number(s): (866) 299-3188  
Conference Code: (415) 972-5623

Prior email:

Dear Diane, Mark and Larry,

We had some very productive discussions with you about the WQCP Phase I work over the summer. One of the things we discussed during those conversations is that EPA action on water quality standards will be subject to Section 7 compliance with the Services under the Endangered Species Act. We followed up on this with the Services by asking them to describe what kind of information and at what level of detail would be required to consult under Section 7 of ESA.

They gave us a list of information and analysis they would need and we are hoping as much of this information as possible will be included in the either the next version of the Phase I Draft SED or the final SED.

Information and quantification of the positive or negative impacts the proposed action will have on the species and critical habitat listed below will be necessary for us to complete consultation.

- Threatened Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon and their critical habitat
- Threatened Central Valley steelhead and their critical habitat
- Threatened Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American green sturgeon and their proposed critical habitat
- Threatened Delta smelt and their critical habitat

As the originators of much of the modeling used to interpret the impacts of the proposed changes your perspective on the impacts to these special status species would be much appreciated. I understand the upcoming draft will include impacts (in many cases benefits) to fall-run Chinook that were not quantified in the prior draft. If this additional analysis of aquatic resource impacts could be expanded to include the special status species listed above, that would be informative for EPA and Services in our upcoming discussions as well as the public during the next public review. In particular, information on impacts to the federally listed species and their designated critical habitat regarding abundance, reproduction, distribution, diversity and habitat quality and function will be necessary. Analysis of loss or gain of spatial or temporal aspects of critical habitat, forage, shelter/cover and corridors will also be needed. It will also advance our discussions with the Services if the revised SED includes an explanation of how the proposed flows will compare with the Reasonable Prudent Alternative for the long-term operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project and NMFS Operations Criterion and Plan (OCAP) opinion.

It would probably be good for us to schedule a time to talk about what will and will not be included in the revisions and how EPA can best build on the modeling done for the SED to obtain

any missing information.  
Thank you,  
-Valentina